

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated December 16, 2005, does not address the claim amendments and remarks submitted in applicants' Supplemental Response to the first Office Action on this application. That Supplemental Response was filed on December 13, 2005, just three days before the December 16 Office Action was mailed, and apparently did not reach the Examiner before the December 16 Office Action was mailed.

As stated in the Remarks in the Supplemental Response filed on December 13, 2005, both of the independent claims 1 and 12 were further amended in that Supplemental Response to distinguish over the '511 patent and commercial implementations (Square D's "PowerLink AS" and "PowerLink G3" products) of the product described in the '511 patent. The Square D "PowerLink AS" and "PowerLink G3" products were identified in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted with the Supplemental Response, along with literature relating to the two products, as well as a related U.S. Patent No. 6,813,525.

Applicants respectfully request that the finality of the rejection contained in the Office Action of December 16, 2005, be withdrawn to enable the Examiner to consider the amendments, prior art and arguments submitted in and with the Supplemental Response filed December 13, 2005. Alternatively, reconsideration of this application in light of those materials is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that the amended claims currently pending in this application, i.e., the amended claims presented in the Supplemental Response filed December 13, 2005, clearly distinguish over the new combination of references relied upon in the rejection contained in the December 16 Office Action. The new combination of references is the same '511 patent previously relied upon (and discussed in the Supplemental Response) plus the "PowerLogic Circuit Monitor-Series 2000" literature (hereinafter referred to as "the PowerLogic literature").


Like the "PowerLink" products discussed in the Supplemental Response, the PowerLogic literature discloses a product that had a front-panel interface port (the "optical communications port" referred to in the Office Action) that was not an Ethernet port. The front panel port shown in the PowerLogic literature only provides access to data stored in that particular terminal, and not to any other terminals. Both of the independent claims 1 and 12 were amended in the Supplemental Response to require two Ethernet ports having the same functionality, namely, "for connecting said

electrical power equipment [inside the enclosure] with equipment outside of said enclosure.” In addition, one of the Ethernet ports is defined as being “inaccessible from outside said enclosure when said enclosure is installed,” and the other Ethernet port has been defined as being “accessible from outside said enclosure when said enclosure is installed to enable coupling of said power equipment inside said enclosure to an Ethernet outside said enclosure.” The inaccessible port corresponds to the port 16 in the embodiment depicted in the drawing of this application (used for a safe permanent connection, made during installation of the enclosure, between the power equipment in the enclosure 15 and the user’s local Ethernet), and the accessible port corresponds to the port 14 in the drawing (used for temporary coupling of the power equipment in the enclosure 15 to an external Ethernet after the enclosure has been installed). Neither the ‘511 patent nor the PowerLogic literature discloses an electrical power equipment enclosure that has this combination of ports.

As also pointed out in the Supplemental Response, the enclosure described in the ‘511 patent also does not contain any power monitoring equipment. The enclosure 10 of the ‘511 patent contains circuit breakers that can be controlled to open and close the power lines, and the on/off condition of the breakers is monitored, but there is no equipment for measuring power parameters such as voltage, current, power, etc., which is the primary function of power monitoring equipment. Although the new PowerLogic literature does disclose an enclosure containing power monitoring equipment, neither reference contains any motivation or suggestion to combine the two references, which relate to different technologies. Furthermore, as already discussed, the combination fails to meet the requirements of the current amended claims in any event.

Dated: February 9, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Stephen G. Rudisill

Registration No.: 20,087  
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL  
CORPORATION  
225 W. Washington, Ste. 2600  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-3418  
(312) 425-3900  
Attorneys For Applicant